

REMARKS

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Alexander.

The Examiner in response to Applicants' prior arguments asserts that Alexander teaches that the waveform display region 102 is divided into ten divisions, which the Examiner equates to "LONG data records". However, as is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art and shown by Applicants in Fig. 3 details of the acquired waveform are not readily apparent from the long data record itself. The Examiner states that "it *appears* from the teaching of the cited reference [Alexander] that any waveform with arbitrary number of pulses from the digital oscilloscope 100 can be displayed and thus the cited reference teaches 'the long data record' as a displayed waveform because any waveform meets the claim limitation of 'long data record'." (Emphasis added) From the word "appears" the Examiner admits that Alexander does not mention anywhere the processing of "long data records" and so is making an assumption that is not supported by any language in Alexander.

Further the Examiner asserts that Alexander teaches marker indicators encompassing the boundary of the rescaling rectangle and thus a width and a length with the marker indicators along the low side of the rescaling rectangle spanning the width and having a length of at least one pixel because the line is color-marked and color-marking requires the pixels along the line to be changed and thus the marker indicator along the low side of the rescaling rectangle spanning the width having at least a length of one pixel to indicate the color changes when necessary. However as discussed by Applicants in the Background a width smaller than two or three pixels results in a very narrow vertical line that may be lost in the displayed long data record waveform so the resulting zone regions are difficult to quickly identify and very difficult to manipulate except via conventional knobs. Therefore the marker as recited by Applicants "has at least a minimum length" which is defined in the specification as being "sufficient to enable the user to readily point to it in order to select and manipulate the zoom region." Applicants submit that there is no "marker" associated with the rescaling rectangle

of Alexander that is differentiated from the outline of the rescaling rectangle, and also submits that a length of one pixel is not “sufficient to enable the user to readily point to it.” For clarity Applicants have added the additional phraseology indicating the function of the minimum length of the marker, i.e., the marker may have a length that is greater than the width of the “rescaling rectangle” when the width is only a few pixels, which feature is neither taught nor suggested by Alexander and which further indicates that the marker is separate and apart from, although associated with, the zoom region indicator on the displayed long data record waveform. Thus Applicants submit that Alexander does not teach or suggest displaying a long data record as a waveform and displaying a zoom region indicator having a width together with an associated marker which spans the width but is not less than a minimum width, i.e., is at least a minimum length.

Finally Applicants recite manipulating the zoom region by moving the associated marker along the displayed waveform with a pointer device to display other regions of the displayed waveform as the zoomed waveform. The only manipulation of the zoom region in Alexander is in the forming of the zoom box (rescaling rectangle) over a desired portion of the waveform using a cursor. To “move” the zoom region the old zoom region has to be “undone” and a new one drawn – there is no manipulating the zoom region by moving the associated marker (as opposed to the cursor) along the displayed [long data record] waveform with a pointer device (cursor, for example) to display other regions of the waveform as the zoomed waveform, i.e., using the same zoom region at a different point in the displayed waveform without undoing it and redrawing it at another location as required by Alexander.

With respect to claim 2 Alexander teaches that a DRAM contains data specifying a color for each pixel of the display – background controlled by the computer; and a VRAM also contains data specifying a color for each pixel of the display – the digitized waveforms. However Alexander does not teach or suggest that the color of the zoom region indicator and resulting zoomed waveform be a different color from the one used to display the long data record waveform. Alexander only indicates if a marker and waveform occur at the same pixel location, a priority encoder determines which color appears at that pixel location,

but does not indicate that the rescaling rectangle outline and resulting zoomed waveform have a different color from that of the displayed waveform. Thus claims 1 and 2 are deemed to be allowable as being neither anticipated nor rendered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art by Alexander.

In view of the foregoing remarks entry of this amendment and allowance of claims 1 and 2 are urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested. Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of claims 1 and 2, entry of this amendment is requested as clarifying the issues for appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT L. BEASLEY, ET AL.

By 

Thomas F. Lenihan
Reg. No. 32152
Attorney for Applicants

TEKTRONIX, INC.
P.O. Box 500 (50-LAW)
Beaverton, OR 97077
(503) 627-7266

7452-US1